

Compensating fields and Anomalies in Supergravity

by

Yigal Shamir¹

International Center for Theoretical Physics

P.O.Box 586, 34100 Trieste, ITALY

ABSTRACT

We discuss the quantization of theories which are formulated using compensating fields. In particular, we discuss the relation between the components formulation and the superspace formulation of supergravity theories. The requirement that the compensating field can be eliminated at the quantum level gives rise to on-shell constraints on the operators of the theory. In some cases, the constraints turn out to be physically unacceptable. Using these considerations we show that new minimal supergravity is in general anomalous.

¹Address after August 1st: Department of Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, ISRAEL.

1. Introduction

In this paper we discuss the quantization of theories which are formulated using compensating fields. We focus in particular on the relation between the components formulation and the superspace formulation of supergravity theories. We show that new minimal supergravity is in general anomalous and discuss the relevance of our results to old minimal supergravity.

We will denote as compensating field (or compensator for short) any field which can be eliminated *algebraically* by fixing the invariance under some local symmetry. We then refer to the local symmetry as unphysical. (See refs. [1,2] for a general discussion on compensators). Notice that the algebraic symmetry structure completely determines which fields are compensators. In the following, it will also be useful to distinguish between propagating and non-propagating compensators. The former have kinetic energy terms in the lagrangian whereas the latter do not. Thus, the distinction between the two types of compensators depends on the *dynamics*.

As we will show below, to every compensator there corresponds a constraint or a consistency requirement at the quantum level. The constraint requires that the inhomogeneous term in the field equation of the compensating field vanish on the physical Hilbert space. (The constraint is empty if the action does not contain any term linear in the compensating field). As we will see, the constraint expresses the quantum invariance under the unphysical symmetry needed to eliminate the compensator. It arises because the peculiar transformation law of the compensator allows us to identify it with the parameter of the unphysical local symmetry.

In this paper we discuss in detail compensators for U(1) chiral symmetry. For a propagating compensator we find that the constraint is physically sensible. It expresses the longitudinal component of a massive axial vector field in terms of other fields. But for a non-propagating compensator the constraint requires that the anomaly *operator* be zero which is physically unacceptable.

This example may reflect a more general pattern, namely, constraints generated by propagating compensators are more likely to be physically sensible. In an anomalous theory, the introduction of a non-propagating compensator allows us to trade one inconsistency with another. Without the compensator we face quantum breakdown of the invariance under a local symmetry. With the compensator we can restore the invariance under the local symmetry by a counter-term, but we end up with a constraint which gives rise to a trivial Hilbert space when enforced on the operators of the theory. We stress, however, that at the moment we have no general proof that all constraints generated by propagating compensators are physically acceptable. Thus,

one must examine the constraints generated by all compensators of a given theory on a case by case basis.

The freedom to reformulate a theory using compensators limits considerably the usefulness of the cohomological approach to anomalies. Anomalies in field theory are associated with the existence of non-trivial cocycles of an appropriate BRST operator. The cohomological program treats all symmetries and fields on the same basis. Consequently, the introduction of a compensating field changes the cohomological problem. For instance, if one introduces a conformal compensator, the trace anomaly becomes cohomologically trivial [2]. The question arises where has the information about the anomaly gone. Our answer is that it is now contained in the on-shell constraint that follows from the invariance under dilatations which is now maintained also at the quantum level (though at the price that dilatation is an unphysical symmetry). We anticipate that the constraint will be physically acceptable if and only if the theory is non-anomalous in the usual sense when formulated without the compensator. In the case of a conformal compensator, we expect that the constraint will be physically acceptable for Einstein gravity but physically unacceptable for Weyl gravity.

Our general discussion on compensators is particularly relevant to supersymmetric (SUSY) theories which have some local gauge invariance. SUSY theories can be formulated in several different ways. The most economic formulation contains only physical fields. Its disadvantage is that the SUSY algebra closes only on-shell. In order to obtain a closed SUSY algebra off-shell one introduces auxiliary fields. We refer to this formulation as the “components formulation”. Its characteristic property is that the anticommutator of two SUSY transformations contains not only a translation but also gauge transformations with field dependent coefficients. Thus, one has structure functions instead of structure constants.

A third formulation of SUSY theories is the superspace formulation. For theories with some local gauge invariance the superspace symmetry group is larger and, at the same time, has a simpler structure than the symmetry group of the components formulation. The enlargement of the local symmetry group is achieved at the cost of introducing a large number of compensating fields. In order to go back to the components formulation one eliminates the compensating fields *algebraically* by fixing the invariance under the extra local symmetries of the superspace formulation. This process is usually called going to the Wess-Zumino gauge.

At the classical level, all three formulations are clearly equivalent. We expect that the same statement should remain true at the quantum level. But in order to establish the quantum equivalence one must first study what are the precise conditions needed for quantum consistency in each of these formulations. As follows from our

introductory remarks, *invariance under all local symmetries is not a sufficient condition for quantization in the presence of compensating fields*. In addition, one must verify that the on-shell constraints, which follow from the invariance under the unphysical symmetries, can be imposed on the operators of the theory without leading to a trivial Hilbert space.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we consider a simple example based on the chiral anomaly. The introduction of a compensator allows us to cancel the anomaly with a Wess-Zumino term (at the cost of making the local chiral symmetry unphysical). But for a non-propagating compensator the resulting theory is still inconsistent because the Wess-Zumino term gives rise to a physically unacceptable constraint.

In section 3 we show that the invariance under an unphysical symmetry gives rise to an on-shell constraint. A detailed proof is given for the case of an abelian unphysical symmetry. We expect, however, that analogous results should hold in general.

In section 4 we discuss *new minimal* supergravity [3] in its component formulation. What characterizes new minimal supergravity is the presence of local U(1) chiral symmetry which is gauged by an auxiliary field. We first discuss the differences between new minimal and old minimal supergravity. We then show that local SUSY is anomalous in new minimal supergravity whenever the chiral symmetry is anomalous. If the axial R-current is not conserved the SUSY current is not conserved too.

In section 5 we discuss the relation between the components formulation and superspace formulation. Gates, Grisaru and Siegel [1,4] have studied in detail the various supergravity models in superspace. Our results concerning new minimal supergravity agree with their conclusions, and we do not repeat their analysis here.

We show that invariance under the extra local symmetries of the superspace formulation implies the *equality* of the superspace and components' generating functionals (except for an unimportant normalization constant). Thus, it is impossible that the superspace generating functional will describe a consistent theory if the components formulation generating functional does not. However, in superspace the inconsistency may either take the form of quantum non-invariance under a local symmetry, or be a consequence of an on-shell constraint which cannot be enforced on the operators of the theory. We conclude with some comments on the issue of the consistency of *old minimal* supergravity [5].

2. An example

We begin with a simple example which illustrates how careless treatment of a model containing a compensating field can lead to inconsistencies.

Consider a single free massless Weyl fermion, whose action

$$S_0 = \frac{i}{2} \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(1 - \gamma_5)\not{\partial}\psi, \quad (2.1)$$

is classically invariant under global U(1) rotations. As is well known, requiring Lorentz invariance and Bose symmetry one finds that current conservation is violated in the correlator of three left-handed currents.

We now minimally couple the fermion to an external gauge field

$$S_\psi = S_0 - g \int d^4x A^\mu(x) j_\mu(x), \quad (2.2)$$

$$j_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}(1 - \gamma_5)\gamma_\mu\psi, \quad (2.3)$$

thus promoting the global symmetry to a local one at the classical level. An infinitesimal gauge transformation of the effective action

$$\Gamma(A_\mu) = -i \log Z(A_\mu), \quad (2.4)$$

$$Z(A_\mu) = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{iS_\psi\}, \quad (2.5)$$

is induced by the BRST operator

$$\Sigma = \int d^4x \delta_\sigma A_\mu(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta A_\mu(x)}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\delta_\sigma A_\mu(x) = \frac{1}{g} \partial_\mu \sigma(x), \quad (2.7)$$

where $\sigma(x)$ is a dimensionless anticommuting ghost field. The inability to maintain current conservation at the quantum level manifests itself through the lack of gauge invariance of the effective action

$$\Sigma \Gamma \equiv \int d^4x \sigma(x) \Delta(x) \neq 0. \quad (2.8)$$

In this example of an abelian symmetry, the requirement that the anomaly $\Delta(x)$ be a non-trivial cocycle means that $\Delta(x)$ should be invariant under local chiral transformations. The only candidate with the right dimension and parity is $F\tilde{F}(x)$. Thus,

$$\Delta(x) = cg^2 F\tilde{F}(x), \quad (2.9)$$

where c is a numerical constant.

Because of the anomaly, the external gauge field cannot be quantized in the above model. One way to cancel the anomaly is to add new left-handed fermions with different U(1) charges such that $\text{Tr } Q^3 = 0$. Note that in this case $F\tilde{F}(x)$ remains a non-trivial cocycle, but we have arranged its coefficient to be zero.

We can also try a different approach, namely, we can attempt to make the operator $F\tilde{F}(x)$ cohomologically trivial by adding new external fields with suitable chiral transformation properties. Since $F\tilde{F}(x)$ itself is chirally invariant, the only way to obtain it as the chiral variation of another operator is by adding a real scalar field $\phi(x)$ transforming as

$$\delta_\sigma \phi(x) = v\sigma(x), \quad (2.10)$$

where the constant v has mass dimension one.

Adding the new external field changes the cohomological problem. The new BRST operator is

$$\Sigma' = \Sigma + \int d^4x v\sigma(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta\phi(x)}. \quad (2.11)$$

We can now restore the gauge invariance of the effective action by adding a Wess-Zumino term

$$\Gamma'(A_\mu, \phi) = \Gamma(A_\mu) - \frac{cg^2}{v} \int d^4x \phi(x) F\tilde{F}(x), \quad (2.12)$$

with

$$\Sigma' \Gamma' = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

In the context of ordinary gauge theories, adding the Wess-Zumino term leads to a non-normalizable theory. (The Wess-Zumino term is nevertheless useful in constructing low energy effective chiral lagrangians). In gravity theories, we are faced from the beginning with a non-renormalizable theory. The question of quantum consistency can however be discussed independently¹. If adding a Wess-Zumino term makes the difference between a consistent and an inconsistent theory we should opt for introducing it as a counter-term.

Having obtained a gauge invariant effective action we now want to quantize the external fields. Notice that because of its transformation law eq. (2.10), $\phi(x)$ can be eliminated algebraically using the local chiral invariance and hence it is a compensator. Consequently, there should exist an alternative description of the final theory which does not contain $\phi(x)$ and which has no local chiral invariance. At the moment we want to know whether in adding the Wess-Zumino term we have guaranteed the consistency of the final theory.

¹ The non-renormalizability problem can be solved if (super)gravity is the low energy limit of a more fundamental theory.

In order to see what might go wrong let us first quantize only $\phi(x)$. To this end we functionally integrate over $\phi(x)$ with a suitable measure

$$\begin{aligned} Z(A_\mu) &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \exp\{i\Gamma'(A_\mu, \phi) + S_\phi\} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{iS'_m\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$S'_m = S_\psi + S_\phi - \frac{cg^2}{v} \int d^4x \phi(x) F \tilde{F}(x), \quad (2.15)$$

is the total matter action. The action S_ϕ must be invariant under the local chiral transformations eqs. (2.7) and (2.10). A suitable kinetic energy term is

$$S_\phi = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x (\partial_\mu \phi - mA_\mu)^2, \quad (2.16)$$

where $m = gv$. The new Noether current obtained from the A_μ -variation of the matter action is

$$j'_\mu = j_\mu + v(\partial_\mu \phi - mA_\mu) - \frac{4cg^2}{v} \partial^\nu (\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \phi). \quad (2.17)$$

Notice that the A_μ -variation of the Wess-Zumino term gives rise to an identically conserved current. Using

$$\partial^\mu j_\mu = cg^2 F \tilde{F}, \quad (2.18)$$

as well as the $\phi(x)$ field equation

$$\square \phi = m \partial^\mu A_\mu - \frac{cg^2}{v} F \tilde{F}, \quad (2.19)$$

we find that j'_μ is conserved.

A dispersive analysis of the triangle graph [6] shows that the anomaly is related to a peculiar intermediate state containing two parallel fermions which produce a $\delta(q^2)$ discontinuity. Adding $\phi(x)$ allows us to cancel the anomaly because it produces a similar discontinuity but with an adjustable coefficient.

We can now quantize A_μ in the usual way. The generating functional of the complete quantum theory is

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{iS'\}, \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$S' = -\frac{1}{4} F^2 + S'_m. \quad (2.21)$$

As anticipated, we can reformulate the resulting theory without $\phi(x)$. To this end, we use the local chiral invariance which is now maintained also at the quantum level

to set $\phi(x) = 0$. Fixing the local invariance is done as usual using the Faddeev-Popov method. One multiplies the integrand of eq. (2.20) by unity in the form of

$$1 = \int \mathcal{D}\omega J \delta(\mathcal{F}^{(\omega)}(x)) . \quad (2.22)$$

The notation $\mathcal{F}^{(\omega)}(x)$ stands for the gauge condition $\mathcal{F}(x)$ rotated by a local chiral transformation with parameter $\omega(x)$. As a gauge condition we choose $\mathcal{F}(x) = \phi(x)$. Recall that

$$\phi^{(\omega)}(x) = \phi(x) + v\omega(x) . \quad (2.23)$$

The jacobian is $J = 1$. In choosing this gauge condition we are using the fact that $\phi(x)$ can be identified with the parameter of the local gauge group. We now make a change of variables which is a gauge transformation with parameter $-\omega(x)$. This results in a new expression for the generating functional

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}\omega \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \delta(\phi(x)) \exp\{iS'\} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{iS\} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

where

$$S = \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{4}F^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2 A^2 + S_\psi \right) . \quad (2.25)$$

The action S is obtained from S' of eq. (2.21) simply by setting $\phi(x) = 0$. In going from the first to the second line of eq. (2.24) we have dropped $\int \mathcal{D}\omega$ which is now an overall normalization constant.

We recognize eq. (2.25) as the Stueckelberg model [1,2]. Notice that A_μ has become a massive vector field. In fact, one can identify $\phi(x)$ with its longitudinal component. The Wess-Zumino term has disappeared upon setting $\phi(x) = 0$, and the U(1) current that follows from the action S is the original one j_μ . Thus, the current is anomalous, but this is now harmless because the chiral symmetry is a global one.

Now, suppose that the only thing one had to worry about is keeping the invariance of the generating functional under local chiral transformations. (As we will immediately see, this is not true if one wants to obtain a meaningful quantum field theory). We could then define another generating functional by not adding any kinetic term for $\phi(x)$ at all! Setting $S_\phi = 0$ in eq. (2.15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Z}(A_\mu) &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \exp\{i\Gamma'(A_\mu, \phi)\} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{i\hat{S}'_m\} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

where

$$\hat{S}'_m = S_\psi - \frac{cg^2}{v} \int d^4x \phi(x) F \tilde{F}(x) . \quad (2.27)$$

A glance at eq. (2.27) reveals what goes wrong. $\phi(x)$ occurs in the action $\hat{S}'_m$ as a Lagrange multiplier. Functionally integrating over it gives rise to

$$\hat{Z}(A_\mu) = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \delta(F\tilde{F}(x)) \exp\{iS_\psi\}. \quad (2.28)$$

Equivalently, the current that follows from the action $\hat{S}'_m$ is

$$\hat{j}'_\mu = j_\mu - \frac{4cg^2}{v} \partial^\nu (\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \phi). \quad (2.29)$$

It satisfies

$$\partial^\mu \hat{j}'_\mu = cg^2 F\tilde{F}, \quad (2.30)$$

but the r.h.s. of eq. (2.30) is set to zero by the $\phi(x)$ field equation which is $F\tilde{F}(x) = 0$.

Obviously, the constraint $F\tilde{F}(x) = 0$ is physically unacceptable. Since $F\tilde{F}(x)$ has non-vanishing matrix elements between the vacuum and two photon states, enforcing this constraint would require the absence of two photon states from the Hilbert space. But this is inconsistent with the canonical commutation relations for A_μ and hence A_μ cannot be quantized. In fact, one cannot even require that the A_μ field equation should hold for A_μ as a classical field, because on a general n -fermion state one has $F_{cl}\tilde{F}_{cl}(x) \neq 0$. Thus, requiring $F\tilde{F}(x) = 0$ plus the classical A_μ field equation gives rise to a trivial Hilbert space containing only the vacuum state.

Suppose that, ignoring the unacceptable consequences of the action $\hat{S}'_m$ we proceeded as in the previous case. We could define a generating functional

$$\hat{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{i\hat{S}'\}, \quad (2.31)$$

where

$$\hat{S}' = -\frac{1}{4}F^2 + \hat{S}'_m. \quad (2.32)$$

Just like Z of eq. (2.20), the generating functional $\hat{Z}$ is invariant under local chiral transformation. We can therefore repeat the Faddeev-Popov procedure to eliminate $\phi(x)$. The result is

$$\hat{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\{i\hat{S}\}, \quad (2.33)$$

where

$$\hat{S} = \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{4}F^2 + S_\psi \right). \quad (2.34)$$

At first glance it seems that fixing the local chiral invariance we have obtained a generating functional which is still invariant under local chiral transformations. . . But, of course, this is not true because the local chiral invariance of $\hat{S}$ is lost at the quantum level, which is precisely the anomaly we have tried to avoid!

3. Derivation of the on-shell constraint

The example of the previous section shows that in a theory which is formulated using compensating fields, trivial cohomology is not a sufficient condition for quantization. This result is not surprising. The ability to consistently quantize a theory cannot depend entirely on its algebraic symmetry structure.

In addition to algebraic properties, what enters the diagrammatic analysis of anomalies is the kinematics of the quantized fields. When all fields have the kinetic energy terms appropriate to their spin, the analysis of anomalies can be reduced to an algebraic problem. In the above example, the anomaly could be eliminated either by adding more fermions with suitable charges or by adding a propagating compensator. These two choices have different physical content but they are both consistent. What is common to both is that the new fields change the matrix element of the current between *physical states*. On the other hand, in the case of the non-propagating compensator no change occurred in this matrix element, and the anomaly was “avoided” by the inconsistent requirement that the relevant two photon states be absent from the Hilbert space.

Since trivial cohomology is not a sufficient condition for quantization in a theory formulated with compensators, the need arises for additional criteria that will allow us to determine which theories can be consistently quantized. In this section we will show that each compensating field gives rise to a constraint. The constraint requires that the inhomogeneous term in the field equation of the compensator vanish on the physical Hilbert space. Thus, the content of these constraints determines whether the theory can be quantized consistently. We will derive the constraint for a compensator which can be eliminated by fixing an abelian unphysical symmetry (henceforth denoted as abelian compensator). We expect, however, that similar results should hold in general.

Before the actual derivation let us examine the content of the constraints in the examples of the previous section. In the case of the non-propagating compensator, the action contained only a term linear in $\phi(x)$. The corresponding field equation was $F\tilde{F}(x) = 0$. This equation is clearly a constraint even before one sets the compensator to zero and, furthermore, it is obvious that this constraint is physically unacceptable.

The field equation for the propagating compensator is eq. (2.19). Setting $\phi(x) = 0$ in this equation we obtain the constraint

$$m^2 \partial^\mu A_\mu = cg^3 F\tilde{F}. \quad (3.1)$$

The easy way to verify that this constraint is physically sensible is to examine the A_μ field equation after the elimination of the compensator. As follows from the action S

of eq. (2.25), this field equation is

$$\partial^\nu F_{\nu\mu} + m^2 A_\mu = g j_\mu. \quad (3.2)$$

Acting on this equation with ∂^μ and using the anomaly equation (2.18) we obtain eq. (3.1).

The physics behind this constraint is that a massive vector field contains only three degrees of freedom, but in order to describe it in a Lorentz covariant way one needs the A_μ field which has four components. Thus, one of the components of A_μ should not be independent. If the massive vector field were coupled to a conserved current its field equation would imply the vanishing of $\partial^\mu A_\mu$. In general, however, the source current need not be conserved and the A_μ field equation allows us to express $\partial^\mu A_\mu$ in terms of the divergence of the source current.

We will now prove the existence of the on-shell constraint for an abelian compensator. As we will see, the constraint is a consequence of the invariance of the generating functional under the corresponding unphysical symmetry. It can be expressed in terms of the field equation of the compensator because of its peculiar transformation law. (One might worry whether the unphysical symmetry could be anomalous. As the example of the previous section shows, any non-invariance of the effective action can be cancelled by a counter-term which depends linearly on the compensator. This property is obvious for an abelian compensator and we expect it to be true in general).

Consider a theory which is formulated using an abelian compensator $\phi(x)$ as well as other fields. We denote all the other fields collectively as $\chi(x)$. The generating functional

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\chi \exp\{iS(\phi, \chi)\}, \quad (3.3)$$

is invariant under local U(1) transformations with parameter $\omega(x)$. We assume that the $\phi(x)$ transformation law is given by eq. (2.23). Let us separate the $\mathcal{D}\phi$ integration in eq. (3.3) by rewriting it as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\phi Z(\phi), \quad (3.4)$$

$$Z(\phi) = \int \mathcal{D}\chi \exp\{iS(\phi, \chi)\}. \quad (3.5)$$

$Z(\phi)$ can be thought of as the generating functional where $\phi(x)$ is an external field. Notice, however, that it contains the complete action including in particular possible kinetic terms for $\phi(x)$.

We observe that $Z(\phi)$ too is invariant under local chiral transformations. Because of the special transformation law of $\phi(x)$, the jacobian arising from the following change of variables in $Z(\phi)$

$$\chi \rightarrow \chi^{(\omega)}, \quad (3.6)$$

is always the same as the jacobian arising from the simultaneous change of variables in Z

$$(\chi, \phi) \rightarrow (\chi^{(\omega)}, \phi^{(\omega)}) . \quad (3.7)$$

By assumption, any non-trivial jacobian that may arise from the above change of variables in Z is cancelled by the non-invariance of the action. The same statement is therefore true for $Z(\phi)$. As a result

$$Z(\phi^{(\omega)}) = Z(\phi) . \quad (3.8)$$

But for $\phi(x)$ a gauge transformation is simply a shift! Consequently,

$$Z(\phi + \delta\phi) = Z(\phi^{(v^{-1}\delta\phi)}) = Z(\phi) . \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, the invariance of $Z(\phi)$ under local gauge transformations implies that it is ϕ -independent. We rewrite this statement as

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi} Z(\phi) = 0 . \quad (3.10)$$

We make contact with the previous section by noting that the result of performing the Faddeev-Popov procedure can be written as

$$\int \mathcal{D}\phi Z(\phi) = \left(\int \mathcal{D}\phi \right) Z(0) . \quad (3.11)$$

We see that equality in eq. (3.11) holds in fact already at the level of the integrand.

Eq. (3.10) is identical to the $\phi(x)$ field equation obtained from the generating functional Z provided we treat $\phi(x)$ as a classical field. In particular, evaluating the l.h.s. of eq. (3.10) at $\phi(x) = 0$ we obtain the promised constraint. The above analysis can be repeated without change if gauge invariant sources are added to the generating functional. As a result, the constraint applies to the entire physical Hilbert space.

Although we have derived the constraint for a single abelian compensator, we expect that the same result should hold in general. In more complicated situation (such as the superspace formulation of supergravity theories) one may face a large number of compensators transforming in a complicated way under a large number of unphysical symmetries. Nevertheless, the requirement that all compensators can be eliminated algebraically implies a one-to-one correspondence between the unphysical symmetries and the compensators. To each compensator it should be possible to associate an unphysical symmetry under which it transforms by a shift. Thus, the above analysis can be repeated with the conclusion that each compensator gives rise to the corresponding on-shell constraint.

4. New minimal supergravity

As discussed above, in a theory formulated with compensators, the invariance under the unphysical symmetries implies certain constraints on the physical Hilbert space. The successful quantization of the theory depends on one's ability to impose these constraint on the operators of the theory without creating physically unacceptable consequences.

In this section we apply the above general consideration to *new minimal* supergravity. The simplest way to deal with the new constraints is to avoid them altogether by formulating the theory without compensators! For supergravity theories, this means that one has to use the components formulation. As discussed below, new minimal supergravity has the peculiar property that one of its auxiliary fields enters the action as a Lagrange multiplier. Thus, even in the components formulation one field equation is a constraint. We will show that, in general, both the invariance under local SUSY transformations and the constraint are violated at the quantum level.

The physical fields of the supergravity multiplet are the tetrad e_μ^a and the gravitino ψ_μ^α . On-shell, each of these fields have two degrees of freedom. Off-shell, the tetrad has six degrees of freedom whereas the gravitino has twelve. (One counts the number of components minus the number of local symmetries which are gauged by the field). A minimal set of auxiliary fields should therefore contain six bosonic degrees of freedom.

In global SUSY, i.e. for chiral and vector multiplets, the auxiliary fields are uniquely determined. In supergravity, on the other hand, there exist two minimal sets of auxiliary fields. In “old minimal” supergravity [5] one introduces an axial vector A_μ , a real scalar S and a pseudoscalar P .

In “new minimal” supergravity [3] one introduces an axial *gauge* field A_μ and an antisymmetric tensor $a_{\mu\nu}$. The A_μ field gauges a global R-symmetry of the on-shell formulation. Because of the local chiral invariance it contributes $4 - 1 = 3$ degrees of freedom off-shell. There is an additional gauge symmetry which acts only on the antisymmetric tensor. Its transformation law is $\delta a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{[\mu} \Lambda_{\nu]}$. Thus, $a_{\mu\nu}$ also contributes $6 - 3 = 3$ degrees of freedom. For the supergravity transformation rules of each formulation we refer the reader to the original literature.

In each off-shell formulation one can describes a different set of on-shell theories. What characterizes the on-shell models obtained from new minimal supergravity is the presence of a global R-invariance. This restriction is absent in old minimal supergravity which describes a much bigger class of models.

Many on-shell theories can however be described in both off-shell formulations.

In particular, these include supergravity coupled to (abelian or non-abelian) vector multiplets. We will show below that *new minimal* supergravity coupled to vector multiplets is anomalous. (In the presence of scalar multiplets anomaly cancellation is possible). It is a commonly held view that, in the absence of gauge anomalies, *old minimal* supergravity coupled to matter gives rise to a consistent quantum theory. In our opinion, a satisfactory proof of the consistency of old minimal supergravity has not been given to date, and we prefer to leave it as an open question. In any event, before we prove the existence of an anomaly in new minimal supergravity there is an apparent paradox which must be resolved. Using the field equations of the auxiliary field one can superficially reduce both off-shell formulations to the same on-shell theory. How can one off-shell formulations be inconsistent without implying that the other one is inconsistent too?

We claim that the two off-shell formulations should be regarded as two *different* theories. The coupling of a quantum matter system to external linearized supergravity requires the existence of a conserved, symmetric energy-momentum tensor and a conserved spinor current. Furthermore, these currents must belong to a supermultiplet which forms an irreducible representation of global SUSY [7,8]. The other currents in this multiplet are sources for the auxiliary fields of the supergravity multiplet. In particular, in both old and new minimal supergravity the field A_μ couples to an axial R-current.

Now, because of their different sets of auxiliary fields and different supergravity transformations rules, the two off-shell formulations define two different current algebras. The main difference is that the new minimal current algebra [3,10] requires the conservation of the axial current whereas the old minimal current algebra [7] does not. As a result, the Ward identities of the two formulations have different content. In the limit of weak supergravity fields they lead to different predictions for the matrix elements of the currents between physical states. Since these are physical observables, we necessarily reach the conclusion that the two minimal formulations are in fact different theories.

How are these two options reflected in the on-shell formulation? At the classical level both current algebras reduce to the superconformal current algebra. The differences between them arise only at the quantum level and reflect the existence of chiral and (super)conformal anomalies. One effectively chooses between the two off-shell formulations by postulating additional, *anomalous* terms in the transformation law of the spinor and axial currents.

The occurrence of anomalous terms in the transformation law of certain composite operators is known as the Konishi anomaly [9]. These terms are necessary in

order to maintain the supermultiplet structure at the quantum level [9,10]. That the transformation law of the SUSY current itself must be modified at the quantum level has not been fully appreciated in the literature. (The transformation law of the axial current has been recently discussed in ref. [11]). This issue is discussed in more detail in a separate publication [12]. The fact that new minimal supergravity is in general anomalous implies that, if one postulates the additional quantum terms appropriate to the current algebra of new minimal supergravity, then one is bound to violate some on-shell Ward identities. We consider as an open question whether all Ward identities are satisfied if one postulates the additional quantum terms appropriate to old minimal supergravity.

Having clarified the differences between old and new minimal supergravity we now proceed to show that new minimal supergravity is in general anomalous. We will show that in new minimal supergravity, a local supersymmetry anomaly is an immediate consequence of the chiral anomaly. Thus, a necessary condition for the consistency of new minimal supergravity is the existence of a conserved R-current.

Although the components formulation contains no compensating fields, it turns out that the axial gauge field A_μ enters the action as a Lagrange multiplier. Its field equation is therefore a constraint. Explicitly, it requires that the axial R-current be equal on-shell to the field strength of the antisymmetric tensor $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\tau}\partial_\nu a_{\sigma\tau}$. Since the latter is an identically conserved current, the constraint requires that the axial current be conserved. Thus, the A_μ field equation – the constraint – is violated whenever the axial current is not conserved. As a result, one can no longer use the field equations of the auxiliary fields to reduce the off-shell formulation to the on-shell one.

In addition to the new minimal supergravity multiplet let us now introduce a vector multiplet (B_μ, λ, D) . For a Yang-Mills multiplet there is an additional adjoint representation index which we suppress. The local new minimal SUSY algebra is [3]

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_S(\eta)\delta_S(\zeta) - \delta_S(\zeta)\delta_S(\eta) &= \delta_{gc}(-\xi^\mu) + \delta_S\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\xi^\mu\psi_\mu\right) \\ &+ \delta_L(-\xi^\mu\omega_{\mu ab} - \frac{\kappa}{2}\xi^c V^d \epsilon_{abcd}) + \delta_R(-\frac{\kappa}{2}\xi^\mu A_\mu) + \delta_G(-g\xi^\mu B_\mu) \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\xi^\mu = 2i\bar{\zeta}\gamma^\mu\eta, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\omega_{\mu ab} = \omega_{\mu ab}(e) - \frac{i\kappa^2}{4}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma_a\psi_b + \bar{\psi}_a\gamma_\mu\psi_b - \bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma_b\psi_a), \quad (4.3)$$

is the spin connection and

$$V^\mu = e^{-1}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\tau}\left(\partial_\nu a_{\sigma\tau} + \frac{i\kappa}{2}\bar{\psi}_\nu\gamma_\sigma\psi_\tau\right). \quad (4.4)$$

In eq. (4.1), $\delta_S(\eta)$ is a local SUSY transformation where the anti-commuting parameter η is a Majorana spinor. $\delta_{gc}(-\xi^\mu)$ is a general coordinate transformation with (commuting) parameter ξ^μ . The other terms on the r.h.s. of eq. (4.1) stand for local SUSY, Lorentz, axial and gauge transformations with the specified field dependent parameters. Notice that the role of these terms is to covariantize the local translation with respect to all other local symmetries. (In section 2 we introduced the BRST operator which is defined in terms of ghost parameters with inverse statistics. Here we find it more convenient to introduce parameters with normal statistics). We also give the commutator of local SUSY and chiral transformations

$$\delta_S(\eta)\delta_R(\omega) - \delta_R(\omega)\delta_S(\eta) = \delta_S(i\omega\gamma_5\eta) . \quad (4.5)$$

We now consider the quantization of the matter sector with the fields of the supergravity multiplet as external sources. We intend to examine the behaviour of the effective action

$$\Gamma = \Gamma^{(0)} + \hbar\Gamma^{(1)} + \dots , \quad (4.6)$$

under local chiral and SUSY transformations. A technical difficulty is that the gauge fixing terms needed for the quantization of the gauge field B_μ break SUSY explicitly. However, this breaking disappears if one evaluates the matrix elements of gauge invariant operators between physical states [13].

The tree level effective action respects all classical symmetries. At the one loop level we may encounter anomalies. We define the chiral and SUSY anomalies respectively by

$$A_R(\omega) = \delta_R(\omega)\Gamma^{(1)} , \quad (4.7)$$

$$A_S(\eta) = \delta_S(\eta)\Gamma^{(1)} , \quad (4.8)$$

with the understanding that a projection onto physical states is applied (e.g. by using the LSZ reduction formalism) in eq. (4.8).

In four dimension there are no gravitational and Lorentz anomalies. We furthermore assume the absence of gauge anomalies. Thus,

$$\delta_{gc}\Gamma = \delta_L\Gamma = \delta_G\Gamma = 0 . \quad (4.9)$$

We now obtain the Wess-Zumino consistency conditions by applying the operatorial equations (4.1) and (4.5) to $\Gamma^{(1)}$. We obtain, respectively

$$\delta_S(\eta)A_S(\zeta) - \delta_S(\zeta)A_S(\eta) = A_S\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\xi^\mu\psi_\mu\right) + A_R\left(-\frac{\kappa}{2}\xi^\mu A_\mu\right) , \quad (4.10)$$

$$\delta_S(\eta)A_R(\omega) - \delta_R(\omega)A_S(\eta) = A_S(i\omega\gamma_5\eta) . \quad (4.11)$$

Eq. (4.10) implies that the SUSY anomaly cannot vanish unless the chiral anomaly does. Thus, new minimal supergravity cannot be quantized if the R-current is anomalous, for in this case the SUSY current is anomalous too.

The Wess-Zumino consistency condition (4.11) can be easily solved. We write

$$A_S = A_S^{cov} + A_S^{non}. \quad (4.12)$$

The two terms on the r.h.s. of this equation denote the covariant and non-covariant parts of the SUSY anomaly with respect to axial transformations. We now demand

$$\delta_S(\eta)A_R(\omega) - \delta_R(\omega)A_S^{non}(\eta) = A_S^{non}(i\omega\gamma_5\eta), \quad (4.13)$$

$$-\delta_R(\omega)A_S^{cov}(\eta) = A_S^{cov}(i\omega\gamma_5\eta). \quad (4.14)$$

An explicit solution for A_S^{non} is given below. The only restriction on A_S^{cov} that follows from eq. (4.14) is that its chiral charge is minus one. We have not been able so far to find an explicit expression for A_S^{cov} .

Before we proceed to the superspace formulation let us examine the possibility of anomaly cancellation. The axial charge of the gravitino ψ_μ and the gaugino λ is one. A_μ transforms as a gauge field whereas all other fields of the supergravity and vector multiplets are chirally inert. If scalar multiplets are added, the chiral charges of the scalar, fermion and auxiliary components are q , $q - 1$ and $q - 2$ respectively, where q is the chiral weight of the multiplet and is a-priori a free parameter.

The R-current anomaly consists of three independent contributions $F\tilde{F}$, $R\tilde{R}$ and $G\tilde{G}$. $F_{\mu\nu}$ and $G_{\mu\nu}$ are respectively the field strength of A_μ and B_μ . $R_{\mu\nu}^{ab}$ is the Riemann tensor. The field strength of the auxiliary field A_μ should vanish on-shell [5], and so the term $F\tilde{F}$ is most likely harmless. This leaves two independent anomalies $G\tilde{G}$ and $R\tilde{R}$ to worry about. In particular, we conclude that new-minimal supergravity coupled to a Yang-Mills multiplet is always anomalous. Upon adding scalar supermultiplets, anomaly cancellation becomes possible. If the additional scalar multiplets have only kinetic terms their chiral weights remain as free parameters. (However, different assignments of chiral weights give rise to different lagrangians [3]). Thus, for instance, if one couples supersymmetric QCD with two quark flavours to new minimal supergravity, the chiral weights of the two quark families can be adjusted to achieve anomaly cancellation. However, if one adds an (R-covariant) superpotential the chiral weights of the scalar multiplets are fixed and anomaly cancellation becomes more involved.

Explicit solutions for the non-covariant part of the SUSY anomaly can easily be found. The non-covariant part that correspond to $G\tilde{G}$ is

$$A_S^{non} = -2i\kappa \int d^4x A_\mu \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} \bar{\eta} \gamma_\nu \lambda. \quad (4.15)$$

Analogous expression exists for the gravitational term with λ replaced by the SUSY variation of the spin connection. The anomaly (4.15) implies that SUSY is violated in the correlator of the SUSY current with an axial current and the source currents for the gluon and the gaugino. SUSY violation in this Ward identity is in fact a consequence of the “wrong” transformation laws postulated for the SUSY and axial currents. One can check that there is no anomaly in the corresponding Ward identity in old minimal supergravity.

5. The relation between superspace formulation and the components formulation

In the previous section we showed that local SUSY is anomalous in new minimal supergravity whenever the chiral symmetry is anomalous. Thus, new minimal supergravity cannot be quantized if the *axial current* is not conserved.

The question arises whether one could do better in the superspace formulation of new minimal supergravity. Answering this question is somewhat tricky because in superspace the distinction between new and old minimal supergravity lies in fine detail. Certain manipulations in superspace can effectively take us from new to old minimal supergravity (or to a non-minimal theory). With this reservation in mind our answer to the above question is on the negative.

The crucial observation that follows from our general discussion on compensators is the following. In field theory, one can always reformulate a given theory using compensators. But when one introduces a new compensating field into the action, *the generating functional for the original fields remains independent of the new compensator* (recall $Z(\phi)$ of section 3). Thus, setting all compensating fields to zero does not change the generating functional (except for an unimportant normalization constant, see eq. (3.11)). Therefore, instead of asking what are the detailed manipulations one does in superspace, we can ask directly what effect they could have on the components formulation after the compensating fields have been eliminated.

For the case at hand, the effect of possible superspace counter-terms depends on whether the chiral compensator is propagating or not. If the compensator is non-propagating, no trace of it will be left in the Wess-Zumino gauge. This means that the superspace theory is inconsistent, because its generating functional is *equal* to the generating functional of the components formulation which does not describe a consistent quantum theory. If the chiral compensator is propagating, we end up with a *different* lagrangian at the component level which has no local chiral invariance.

But this means that the components formulation is now *old minimal* supergravity! The modifications needed in order to obtain a propagating chiral compensator have the effect of replacing new minimal by old minimal supergravity at the superspace level.

Gates, Grisaru and Siegel [4] have discussed in detail the properties of the various supergravity models in superspace. Our results concerning the inconsistency of new minimal supergravity agree with their conclusions and we will not repeat their analysis here.

Few comments are however in place. Let us first recall what are the basic objects needed to describe a supergravity theory in superspace. One introduces the vielbein E_M^A and the spin superconnection ϕ_{MAB} . They are responsible for invariance under superdiffeomorphisms and superlocal Lorentz transformation respectively. (In this section we follow the notation of ref. [14]). In the Wess-Zumino gauge for supergravity one can identify some of their lowest components with the physical fields. Denoting $\theta = \bar{\theta} = 0$ components by $|$, the tetrad is $E_m^a|$, the gravitino is $E_m^\alpha|$ and the spin connection is $\phi_{mab}|$. Also,

$$E_\mu^a| = E_\mu^a| = E_\mu^{\dot{a}}| = E_\mu^\alpha| = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

$$E_\mu^\alpha| = \delta_\mu^\alpha, \quad (5.2a)$$

$$E_\mu^{\dot{\alpha}}| = \delta_\mu^{\dot{\alpha}}. \quad (5.2b)$$

The vielbein and the spin superconnection are sufficient in order to describe old minimal supergravity in superspace. In order to describe new minimal as well as non-minimal models one also introduce a U(1) superconnection Γ_M which gauges U(1) rotations in the fermionic tangent space. Its generator is

$$X_a^b = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

$$X_\alpha^\beta = i\delta_\alpha^\beta, \quad (5.4a)$$

$$X_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\beta}} = -i\delta_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\beta}}. \quad (5.4b)$$

$\Gamma_m|$ is closely related to the chiral gauge field of new minimal gravity, see below.

It turns out that the superspace formulation has an additional local invariance under so-called super-Weyl transformations. super-Weyl transformations form an abelian group parametrized by a chiral superfield. Their descendants in the component formulation are conformal transformations.

The above geometrical objects carry superspace indices and so they contain a large number of superfields. These superfields are not all independent. One relates

them by postulating invariant superspace constraints². The introduction of invariant constraints is necessary, for instance, in order to avoid the appearance of several independent connections for a single local symmetry at the component level. Most of the constraints leave the invariance under Weyl transformations intact. One more constraint is needed in order to reduce the theory from conformal to Poincaré supergravity. Depending on which constraint is chosen, one obtains old minimal, new minimal or a non-minimal model already at the superspace level.

Solving the Poincaré supergravity constraint gives rise to a smaller local symmetry group with a more complicated structure. It is more convenient to express this constraint in terms of an additional superfield whose components are all compensators. The compensating superfield is built out of the vielbein and the spin superconnection and there is no need to introduce it as an additional independent object. It compensates in a supersymmetric way for some or all of the Weyl transformation, thus making them unphysical symmetries.

Our first comment concerns the identification of the local chiral symmetry of new minimal supergravity with one of the superspace symmetries. To the single local R-symmetry that one has in the component formulation, there correspond *four* local symmetries (or three if a reality condition is imposed) in superspace!

The most obvious descendants of the R-symmetry of global SUSY is what we call R-superdiffeomorphisms. The parameters of these superdiffeomorphisms are

$$\xi^m(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = 0, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\xi^\mu(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = i\omega(x)\theta^\mu, \quad (5.6a)$$

$$\bar{\xi}^{\dot{\mu}}(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) = -i\bar{\omega}(x)\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\mu}}. \quad (5.6b)$$

The transformation law under R-superdiffeomorphisms is therefore determined by the *curved* fermionic indices. (Imposing a reality condition amounts to setting $\bar{\omega}(x) = \omega^*(x)$).

Another chiral symmetry belongs to the super-Weyl group. It is parametrized by the imaginary part of the lowest component of its parameter superfield. Finally, there is the chiral symmetry gauged by the ordinary connection which is contained in the U(1) superconnection. (In old minimal supergravity the U(1) superconnection is not an independent object).

² The reader should not mix the invariant superspace constraints with the on-shell constraints of the previous sections. The former are *postulated* in order to reduce the number of independent superfields needed to describe the theory. The latter are *derived* from the invariance under the unphysical symmetries of the superspace formulation.

In order to reduce the number of local chiral symmetries to one (or to zero in the case of old minimal supergravity), the superspace formulation should contain several chiral compensators. Two chiral compensators are easily found. Following ref. [1], we parametrize the part of the vielbein with only dotted (only undotted) indices as

$$E_\mu^\alpha = N_\mu^\alpha \exp\{\Phi\}, \quad (5.7a)$$

$$E_\mu^{\dot{\alpha}} = \widetilde{N}_\mu^{\dot{\alpha}} \exp\{\widetilde{\Phi}\}, \quad (5.7b)$$

where N_μ^α and $\widetilde{N}_\mu^{\dot{\alpha}}$ are $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ supermatrices. Notice that the superfields Φ and $\widetilde{\Phi}$ are not ordinary scalar superfields. Their transformation law under superdiffeomorphisms is determined implicitly by the transformation law of the vielbein.

The chiral compensators are $Im\Phi|$ and $Im\widetilde{\Phi}|$. (The real parts are compensators for scale transformations). Indeed, in the Wess-Zumino gauge (see eq. (5.2)) one has $\Phi| = \widetilde{\Phi}| = 0$ (as well as $N| = \widetilde{N}| = I$). Notice that the compensators are basically the logarithm of the fermionic vielbein. Usually, the phase and modulus of a given field are not “legal” fields. Using them gives rise to singularities due to the behaviour of the logarithm at zero. However, the fermionic vielbein is expanded around the identity matrix (it is equal to the identity matrix in the Wess-Zumino gauge) and so the parametrization (5.7) is legitimate.

Since the superspace formulation contains several “copies” of the chiral symmetry, the transformation law of a physical field such as the gaugino under the superspace chiral symmetries is ambiguous. The only requirement is that it transforms suitably under the linear combination which survives in the components formulation. For instance, the definitions $\lambda_\alpha = W_\alpha|$ and $\lambda_\alpha = \exp\{iIm\Phi\}W_\alpha|$ are both acceptable, but they imply different transformation roles for the gaugino under the superspace symmetries.

With different definitions for the gaugino, the chiral anomaly will appear as a breakdown of the invariance under different superspace symmetries. We can then build Wess-Zumino terms using the chiral compensators. Thanks to the one-to-one correspondence between compensators and the extra symmetries of the superspace formulation, we can always limit the quantum non-invariance to a single chiral symmetry, say, to the chiral symmetry gauged by the $U(1)$ superconnection. An interesting question is whether one can restore the invariance under *all* chiral symmetries at the superspace level. At the moment we do not exclude this possibility. Notice that our statement regarding the equality of the superspace and components’ generating functionals is not effected by this uncertainty, because it depends only on the quantum invariance under the extra symmetries which are eliminated in the Wess-Zumino gauge.

Our second comment concerns the important issue of the consistency of *old minimal* supergravity. A cohomological analysis of the superspace formulation of old minimal supergravity was done by Bonora, Pasti and Tonin [15]. They were able to show that superdiffeomorphisms and the super-Lorentz group are cohomologically trivial. This result alone implies that among the superspace symmetries of old minimal supergravity only the super-Weyl group could possibly be anomalous, and that its anomaly can be brought into a supersymmetric form. Consequently, using the compensating superfield of old minimal supergravity we can cancel the super-Weyl anomaly without generating superdiffeomorphism or super-Lorentz anomalies. We therefore anticipate that the entire superspace cohomology of old minimal supergravity is trivial.

Because of the presence of compensators, the triviality of the superspace cohomology does not guarantee the consistency of old minimal supergravity. On the other hand, in the components formulation there are no compensators, and so a proof that the supergravity transformations of the components formulation are cohomologically trivial would imply that old minimal supergravity is consistent. Unfortunately, this cohomological problem is considerably more complicated and very little is known about it.

The following scenario illustrates what could go wrong. It is known from explicit calculations [16] to lowest order in the gravitational coupling constant and with the graviton and the gravitino taken on-shell, that the conformal anomalies arising from the quantization of scalar or vector multiplets in an external supergravity background have the supersymmetric form $W^{\alpha\beta\gamma}W_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$. This still leaves open the possibility that contributions which vanish on-shell to this order are not supersymmetric. (For instance, it has not been checked whether contributions proportional to the l.h.s. of the gravitino field equation occur with the right coefficient as required by the supermultiplet structure). We point out that there is no conceptual difficulty in calculating these off-shell contributions because the supergravity fields are considered as external sources. In the event that such terms do not have the desired coefficients, the supermultiplet structure of the conformal anomalies would be destroyed. This, in turn, would imply the existence of a non-trivial cocycle in the components formulation of old minimal supergravity. It is likely that, as a result, a local SUSY anomaly on-shell will appear at a higher order in the gravitational coupling constant.

Now, because of the presence of compensators, the value of the conformal anomalies in the superspace formulation is arbitrary. Indeed, we can use the conformal compensators to build counter-terms which eliminate the conformal anomalies altogether. Furthermore, we can do so regardless of whether or not the conformal anomalies come

with the right coefficients to form a supermultiplet. In the event that the supermultiplet structure is violated, it is not unreasonable to expect that the above counter-terms will restore super-Weyl and superdiffeomorphism invariance simultaneously. According to our general discussion, the inconsistency would then show up as an inability to impose the constraints generated by the component conformal compensators on the physical Hilbert space.

In trying to verify whether the above scenario has anything to do with the true properties of supergravity theories, one should not make use of manifestly supersymmetric methods such as dimensional reduction. In fact, it is known that dimensional reduction is not a consistent regularization scheme [17]. It contains inherent ambiguities related to objects such as $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma\tau}$ and γ_5 . Although in many cases it gives the same results as dimensional continuation (up to finite counter-terms), it is bound to fail precisely when there is an anomaly behind the corner. For instance, if one were to calculate the triangle graph using dimensional reduction, one would have found the wrong result that the axial and vector currents can be conserved simultaneously. Some ad-hoc modifications are needed in order to obtain the chiral anomaly correctly, and there is no guarantee that dimensional reduction will not fail in other circumstances as well.

Other methods exist which partially solve the problem of regularizing a theory while preserving global or local supersymmetry. However, we are not aware of any regularization method which excludes the above scenario. We point out that it is difficult to exclude this scenario even for a scalar multiplet. While Pauli-villars regularization is available which preserve global SUSY, it is not obvious how to generalize it to a locally supersymmetric regularization for the component formulation. The above questions are currently being investigated.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank L. Bonora, S. Elitzur, M. Grisaru and A. Schwimmer for discussions.

References

- [1] S.G. Gates, M.T. Grisaru, M. Roček and W. Siegel, *Superspace*, Benjamin/Cummings Publ., 1983.
- [2] M.T. Grisaru and B. de Wit, in *Quantum Field Theory and Quantum Statistics*, Vol. 2, eds. I.A. Batalin *et al.* 1985.
- [3] M. Sohnius and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B105** (1981) 353; Nucl. Phys. **B198** (1982) 493.
- [4] S.G. Gates, M.T. Grisaru and W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. **B203** (1982) 189.
- [5] K.S. Stelle and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B74** (1978) 330. S. Ferrara and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **B74** (1978) 333. P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rep. **68** (1981) 189.
- [6] Y. Frishman, A. Schwimmer, T. Banks and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. **B177** (1981) 157.
- [7] S. Ferrara and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B87** (1975) 207.
- [8] V. Ogievetsky and E. Sokatchev, Nucl. Phys. **B124** (1977) 309; S. Ferrara and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B134** (1978) 301.
- [9] K. Konishi, Phys. Lett. **B135** (1984) 439.
- [10] T.E. Klark, O. Piguet and K. Sibold, Nucl. Phys. **B143** (1978) 445; 159 (1979) 1.
- [11] H. Itoyama B. Razzaghe-Ashrafi, Stony Brook preprint ITP-SB-91-40.
- [12] Y. Shamir, in preparation.
- [13] B. de Wit and D.Z. Freedman Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 2286.
- [14] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, Princeton Univ. press, 1983.
- [15] L. Bonora, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, Nucl. Phys. **B252** (1985) 458.
- [16] L.F. Abbott, M.T. Grisaru and H.J. Schnitzer, Phys. Lett. **B73** (1978) 71.
- [17] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. **B94** (1980) 37. G. Bonneau, Phys. Lett. **B96** (1980) 147. L.V. Avdeev, Phys. Lett. **B117** (1982) 317.